

A Joint Meeting of the Troy City Council and the Troy Planning Commission was held Tuesday, October 28, 2003 at the Fire Police Training Center. John Szerlag called the Meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and served as moderator.

ROLL CALL

Present:

City Council Members

Mayor Matt Pryor
David A. Lambert
Robin Beltramini
Cristina Broomfield
David Eisenbacher
Martin F. Howrylak
Jeanne M. Stine

Planning Commission Members

Larry Littman, Chair
Gary Chamberlain (absent)
Dennis A. Kramer
Robert M. Schultz
Walter A. Storrs, III
Thomas Strat
Mark J. Vleck
David T. Waller
Wayne C. Wright

Also Present:

John Szerlag, City Manager
Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney
John M. Lamerato, Assistant City Manager/Finance & Administration
Gary A. Shripka, Assistant City Manager/Services
Peggy E. Clifton, Human Resources Director
Laura Fitzpatrick, Assistant to the City Manager
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney
Mark F. Miller, Planning Director
Brent Savidant, Principal Planner
Doug Smith, Real Estate & Development Director
Mark S. Stimac, Director Building & Zoning

Resolution # PC-2003-11-040

Moved by: Littman
Seconded by: Waller

RESOLVED, That Mr. Chamberlain be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yes: All Planning Commission Members present (8)
No: None
Absent: Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

AGENDA OUTLINE

- 1 Role of Moderator 7:30 – 7:50**
- a) Interest-based approach to problem solving
 - b) Development of ground rules
 - c) Timekeeper volunteer
- 2 Communication 7:50 – 8:15**
- a) Communication links between City Council, Planning Commission, and City Management
 - i. Informal (Ongoing)
 - ii. Formal (Presentations, resolutions, ordinances)
- 3 Defining Role of Planning Commission Related to: 8:15 – 9:00**
- a) Ordinance
 - b) Relationship between Planning Commission/City Council/Management/Board of Zoning Appeals (elevations, drainage, landscaping, existing and proposed grading)
 - c) Final site plan approval
 - d) Special projects
 - i. PUD Procedure
 - ii. Table of Contents for City Code
 - iii. Review of berm and wall requirements
- 4 Maintaining Culture of Professionalism 9:15 – 9:45**
- a) Allocation of Resources
 - i. Staff Time
 - ii. Budget for Planning Commission as it relates to entire City budget
 - b) Development of Process to Recommend Changes to Ordinances
- 5 Planning Process as a Tool to Enhance Economic Viability 9:45 – 10:15**
- a) Maple Road Study
 - b) Suggested Enhancement Projects

NOTES BASED ON DISCUSSION (RECORDED ON EASEL PAPER)Issue: Formalized Communication Between Parties*Interests:*

- Regular meetings
- PC spokespersons (selected by peers) – present at CC meetings (at least one)
- Avoid delay of projects
- Continuous feedback; ongoing communication
- Team approach
- Opportunity for input on project topics
- Abide by charter provision

Options:

- Joint meeting of smaller body
- Identify changes to recommend and attach discussion
- Handle informally while informing petitioner

Issue: Define Role of Planning Commission*Interests:*

- Follow authority in Zoning Ordinance
- Calibrate that authority
- Confidence in roles
- Trust in roles: Planning Commission, City Council, Staff
- Acknowledge/deal with recurring problems
- Clarify/define relationship between Planning Commission and City Council
- What happens in public should not get changed after the fact
- Efficient use of time and resources
- Coordinated PUD process
- Improve PUD process (no corruption)
- Comparative analysis of how others run process
- Creative Incentives
- Discuss opportunities
- Efficient use of staff time (there is limited staff time to meet deadline for six meeting agendas)

Options:

- Engineering approvals as part of the site plan
- Examine/change rules (i.e. standards, ordinances)
- Involve members of the development community
- At meeting, have available document showing approval process

- Identify steps:
 - Whether project qualifies for PUD
 - Preliminary site plan
 - Final site plan
- Calibrate specific PUD standards
- Incorporate partnership with Planning Commission
- Include Table of Contents – is there one?
- Encourage assemblage of property (offer suggestions)

Issue: Maintain culture of professionalism

Interests:

- Efficient use of staff time
- Planning Commission having input into planning process and how budget is spent
- Understanding of Planning Commission budget components

Options:

- All three parties identify priorities
- Share workload
- Hire additional staff
- Reduce number of meetings/fewer meetings
- Planning Commission first gets City Council authorization to move forward on projects (City Council has opportunity for input, providing direction) (i.e., “Here’s what we ‘d like to work for the next quarter.”)
- Identify three areas: 1) Planning Department – short-term immediate tasks; 2) medium term projects; 3) long-term project/goal
- Re-write Master Plan
- Strategic Planning Session for Planning Commission
- Develop process to recommend changes to ordinances

Issue: Planning Process as a Tool to Enhance Economic Viability

Interests:

- Maple Road Study: include Planning Commission in planning process; vital part of the team
- Encourage attraction and retention of business
- Encourage partnership – committees

Options:

- Northwest corner of 16 & Crooks – study re: parking
- Ongoing projects – don’t lose sight of them; i.e., sidewalk plan
- Work with Rochester Hills on Paint Creek Trail
- Create our own destination; to which people want to walk
- Maplelawn
- M-1 Uses
- Rezoning: Citing particular properties on the Future Land Use Plan as part of that review
- Pedestrian Plan

VISITOR COMMENTS

The meeting adjourned at 10:41 p.m.

Lawrence Littman, Chairman

Laura Fitzpatrick, Assistant to City Manager

G:\MINUTES\2003 PC Minutes\Final\10-28-03 Joint CC and PC Minutes_Final.doc